

6783
*The Bloody Methods of propagating the POPISH RELI-
GION a plain Proof that it is not of Divine Original:
Together with a Vindication of our natural, evangelical
and civil Rights of opposing any PRINCE, that shall
attempt to introduce it.*

A
S E R M O N

PREACHED AT

ST. MARY'S in OXFORD,

BEFORE THE

U N I V E R S I T Y,

ON THE

FIFTH of NOVEMBER, 1745.

And published at the

REQUEST of certain of the HEARERS:

By JOHN FREE, D.D.

Then VICE-PRINCIPAL of St. ALBAN HALL in Oxford,
and VICAR of RUNCORN in Cheshire.

τοῖς παιδὶσι ἀκολουθητικῶς ὡς ματαίως ἀχέσται, καὶ ἀμφιλύς
ἔσιν προτιμῶν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ. Aristot. Ethic.

The THIRD EDITION.

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF LONDON
FROM A.D. 1169 TO 1763
BY JOHN HANCOCK
AND JOHN HANCOCK
AND JOHN HANCOCK

S E R M O N

PREACHED AT
St. Mark's in OXFORD



UNIVERSITY

Printed by

AND

Request of

BY JOHN W. R. D. D.

Thames Valley University of St. Albans
and Vice-Chancellor of St. Albans

and Vice-Chancellor of St. Albans

The British Museum

LEVIT. XXIV. 20, 21, 22.

Breach for Breach, Eye for Eye, Tooth for Tooth: As he hath caused a Blemish in a Man, so shall it be done to him again. And he that killeth a Beast, he shall restore it: And he that killeth a Man, shall be put to Death. Ye shall have one manner of Law, as well for the Stranger as for one of your own Country: For I am the Lord your God.

IT may seem something like a Contradiction, after so many Ordinances as are prescribed in this Book to distinguish the Race of Israel, and render them a peculiar People, to hear this Declaration, *Ye shall have one manner of Law, as well for the Stranger as for one of your own Country.*

To clear up this Difficulty we must observe, That there is no Word of a more unlimited and uncertain Signification than the *English* Word, *Law*, as we read it in the Translation both of the *Old* and *New Testament*. Sometimes it means the *Jewish Ceremonial Law*, sometimes the *Law of Nature*, as it means the *Religion of Nature*, sometimes the *Law of Nature*, as it means

Introduction, or Comment upon the Text.

B

Natural

Natural Polity, or the Law of Nations, &c. And these several Meanings, comprehended in the general Term *Law*, are to be distinguished by considering the Nature of the Subject discoursed upon, or the more limited Signification of the correspondent Words in the † original Language.

Now the Word here meaneth *natural Polity*, or *Laws* according to *Nature*: And it signifies as much as if it had been said, The *Law of Nature* shall be the Law to you all. Tho' you the *Jews* have your *Ceremonies*, and the *Stranger* hath none, yet you shall all live by one *Law*, the *Law of Nature*: for that only is one, from the Beginning to the End, As for Declaration this for the God of Nature, the Father both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*! and accordingly he adds, For I am the God and LORD of both. For, would we have the Force of the Original, it is this: *There shall be one Way of judging among you, I speak this to the Stranger and the Native: For I am the Lord of both alike.*

One Way of judging, as to Mens natural Privileges and Properties. For the *Jews* differed from the *Strangers* in Matters of Religion: But yet they were not therefore privileged to hurt the *Stranger*. The *Jewish Dispensation*, undoubtedly a Divine Dispen-

† The Ceremonial Law is expressed by *חוק*, *Form*, *Invention*; but the Word in the Text is *דבר* *Judgment*, *Equity*, *Law*.

Oxford, November, 5, 1755.

3

sation, encouraged no such Proceeding; but on the contrary, *he that killed a Beast was to restore it, and he that killed a Man was to be put to death.* The Words then of the Text plainly insinuate these Two PROPOSITIONS.

I. THAT no Divine Dispensation, either in its *Precepts*, or for the sake of its *Establishment*, can destroy the *Law of Nature*; or give Occasion to cruel, and bloody Purposes.

Division of the Doctrine contained in the Text into two principal Propositions.

II. THAT where Men, are treated *injuriously* and *contrary to Nature*, they may consistently with the *Laws of God*, resist their Enemies: *Breach for Breach, Eye for Eye, Tooth for Tooth, &c.*

THESE Propositions being proved, I shall, after the Proof of each, apply it severally, as it tends, to the two great Events, we this Day commemorate, the *Papish Conspiracy*, and the *Revolution*.

THE first Proposition I undertake to prove is, *That no Divine, &c.* This Proposition consists seemingly of two Members: For I say either in its *Precepts*, or for the sake of its *Establishment*. Which Circumstances however are blended together in the Proof. Because the Reasons are the same for the one, as for the other; and God's Honour is as much concerned in the Manner of establishing a Religion, as in the Precepts contained in it; because a Religion to be established by *Methods unworthy of God* becomes no longer his Dispensation. Such a

First Proposition, tho' complex, admits of the same Proof in both its Members.

Circumstance makes it as inconsistent with his Character, as if it were faulty in its *Precepts*. For it will produce the same ill Consequences, of which God will be the Author, if he order it to be so established; and if he do not order it, then is every such ill Establishment the Work of Men; and being at the same time an Injury to ourselves, that it is an Affront to God, to oppose it will be our Interest, as well as Duty.

*Proof of
the first
Proposition.*

To make way then for the Proof of this Proposition, That no *Divine Dispensation*, can overturn the *Law of Nature*, &c. we must consider, what the Law of Nature is, and who is the Author of it.

*An Account
of the Law
of Nature.*

The Law of Nature, or Rule of Action, between Man and Man, is written (if one may so speak) at least is characterized, and impressed upon the Nature of Things. It is distinguished by observing the Differences and Agreement of Things, and how one is suited or not suited to another. Now what makes this Reason, Fitness, Propriety, or Impropriety, in the Nature of Things a Law to Mankind is, *first* this Discernment, or that particular FACULTY in human Understanding, which distinguishes the Fitness, Men being so contrived by their Maker, as to take their Measure of Action from the true State and Condition of Things: Or if they do not, which is the second Article, that makes the Reason of Things a Law to Men,

*How it
comes to be
taken notice
of.*

and

Oxford, November, 5, 1745.

5

and is as it were the *Penalty* annexed, they are sure to suffer by neglecting, or acting in Contradiction to it. This is a short Account of the Law of Nature, both in its *material* and *formal* Part, and likewise of its Author.

For if God created the *Reason* of Things to be what it is, and the *Understanding* of Man in such a Manner as to apprehend it; and if it be likewise his *Will*, that when Men will not act according to the Reason of Things, they *should suffer for it*: Then is God the AUTHOR OF THE LAW OF NATURE. *Who is its Author.*

FROM this Account then, let this be observed, *first*, that God is the Author of the Law of Nature, *Certain remarkable Truths in this Account, that*

2^{dly}, That this Law as to the *Matter* of it, is stamp'd upon the Nature of Things, and consequently has been, and will be, coeval with Nature, or the Construction of the Universe. *are the Foundation of so many Arguments for the Proposition in question.*

3^{dly}, THAT this Law as to the *Form* of it will have, as far as it is discerned, the same Influence upon Mens *Understandings*, as long as Mens *Understandings* continue human, *i. e.* endued with such Powers and Faculties as by their Make should belong to them.

AND, *lastly*, That it is not for the *Interest* of Mankind to act in Contradiction to the Law of Nature.

If the foregoing Account of it was true, then are all these Propositions true likewise:

B 3

Because

Because they are either contained in that Account, or deduced from it. And in the Procedure of this Discourse I shall make use of them as Maxims of undoubted Truth, to shew the Impossibility there is, that any divine Dispensation should run counter to the Law of Nature.

*First Proof
that the
Law of
Nature
cannot be
destroyed by
any divine
Dispensati-
on, because
the Law of
Nature is
the Law
God, who
is so wise
an Author.*

Now then to come to the Proof, according to the Order here laid down. The first Reason why no divine Dispensation can overturn the Law of Nature will be, because God is the Author of the Law of Nature: For if he as a *Law-giver* do find himself obliged to make new Laws for the same Set of People, in Opposition to those he had before established, it must argue him to be very deficient in his Character; and that he either knew not how to make Laws at all, or at least was not sufficiently acquainted with the Condition, Genius and Temper of his People. Now Mankind ever since the Beginning of Time, have been much the same Sort of Creatures, born with the same Frailties and Wants, the same Passions and Desires which they received from their first Parents. Their natural Genius and Condition, therefore, being in general much the same, it may be supposed, that the wise Author of any Law would calculate it so, as to be adapted to their lasting Wants, and the permanent Part of their Character. We know then that God calculated the Law of Nature

Oxford, November 5, 1745.

7

Nature in this manner; since he is the Author of it and *confessedly* so wise an Author, as not to be capable of Error or Omission. He therefore will never overturn the Law of Nature; and of consequence no *divine* Dispensation will ever overturn it, since *he* must be the *Author* of every such Dispensation. The Law of Nature then is immutable, in the first Place, because it hath God for its *Author*, who, as he is a Being of infinite Wisdom, could never contrive any thing so ill, as that, upon second Thoughts, it should want to be corrected by something quite contrary to what it is.

THE Law of Nature is, *secondly*, immutable, because, as to the Matter of it, it is stamped upon the Nature of Things, and consequently has been, and will be, coeval with Nature, or the Construction of the Universe; and, upon this account, it is immutable. For if the Law of Nature be thus to continue with the World, the deep Root it takes in the Reason of Things, and its twining itself with their Constitution, makes it *naturally* impossible, during the present Frame of Things, that God should go about to change it, by introducing a new Law of Nature.

AND *morally* impossible, *i. e.* considering his moral Character, impossible that it should be changed by any divine Revelation.

B 4

on.

Naturally impossible, from the Impossibility of changing the Nature of Things.

And, because the Nature of Things cannot be

changed,
it is upon
that ac-
count, mo-
rally im-
possible,
that any
divine Dis-
pensation
should de-
stroy the
Law of
Nature.

on. For why, this new Revelation, should it be opposite, would not obliterate the old Law; that would still remain with the World, strongly *engraven* in its old Characters; which would throw Mankind into such a Puzzle and Uncertainty, that, receiving both Laws upon the *same* Authority, they could neither follow the one nor the other. A Confusion, which the Nature of *moral Agents* cannot admit of, and which would reflect as much upon the Justice and Goodness of God, as the Necessity of innovating did upon his Wisdom.

Unless we
suppose,
that hu-
man Under-
standing
may be
changed
though the
Face of
Nature re-
main the
same.

AND yet, *thirdly*, this must be the State of Things, were any Dispensation assuredly divine to clash with the Law of Nature. Unless we suppose another Method possible of rendering those old Tables useless; and that is, by changing the State of Mens Understandings, putting *Bitter for Sweet, and Sweet for Bitter*, and corrupting their Taste accordingly. A Way of Proceeding as impracticable as the former.

Which, in
the present
State, can-
not be ef-
fected.

FOR the changing of *Mens Minds* would be like the other, changing the *Nature of Things*; at least, so far as to alter the *rational* Part of the Creation. Which cannot be, while Men continue Men; that is, endued with such Powers and Faculties as, by their Make, should belong to them.

Or, could
such a
Change be

OR were such a thing possible to be effected in Nature, God, by his *moral Character*.

Oxford, November 5, 1745.

rafter, could never be concerned in it, any more than in the former. It is such a wicked Imposition, as he highly blames in Men, and pronounces, by his * Prophet, a bitter Woe against. The same Reason why it could not be justified in *Man*, is a Reason why it could not be justified in God. For it would drive Men blindfold upon continual Dangers and Confusion; which is always the Consequence of a Course of Action, that is contrary to the *Truth* of the *Case*, and the *Course* of NATURE.

AND forasmuch as the wisest Men are, and, as it has been proved, must always be sensible of *this*: Therefore, *lastly*, it is impossible, upon another Account, that God should overturn the *Law of Nature* for the Sake of any *divine Dispensation*: Because the present Constitution of the World being *unaltered*, and Mens Minds *uncorrupted* by Misrepresentation, as it will not be for their Interest, so they will know, that it is not for their Interest to act in Contradiction to the *Law of Nature*; and the Consideration of this will be to them the *Sanction* of the Law, and the *Motive* of their Obedience. Of Consequence then, God can never be so *weak*, as to offer to Men any *divine Dispensation*, that may oppose the *Law of Nature*: Because it is opposing their *Interest*, and requiring them to depart from

9
effected in human Nature, it is inconsistent with God's moral Character to effect it.

Lastly, upon these Accounts, the Sanction of the Law of Nature will be immovable; which makes it impossible that it should be destroyed.

Isaiah, v. 20.

those

those Obligations, which *he* has laid upon them to obey *that Law*, and subjecting them to Pains and Penalties, which *he* has prescribed, and which, by his *Will*, do naturally ensue, whenever *that Law* is broken. The *new Religion*, at this rate, can have no Sanction to Obedience; but a strong Sanction on the other Side, which commands us to disobey. Another Inconsistency this, with common Wisdom, and common Justice. It is plain then, considering the *Wisdom of God in enacting the Law of Nature*,—*the Unchangeableness of its Characters*,—*and of the Constitution of its Subjects*,—*and the Sanction upon which it is established*,—that no *divine Dispensation* can overturn the *Law of Nature*, or be a proper Ground for introducing a Scene of *Persecution, Blood, and Cruelty*.

The Application of the Doctrine of the first Proposition to the Popish Conspiracy.

IT may not be unreasonable here to ask the *Papists*, What Sort of Religion they are propagating in the Dungeons of the *Inquisition*?—What Sort of Religion they were for establishing in these Kingdoms, by their horrid Plots and Treachery, and dark Designs of Death?—Such a Religion could not be of *divine Original*; because no *divine Dispensation* could thus run counter to the *Law of Nature*. It is to be considered then in another Light; not as the Offspring of God, but as the destructive Machination of very wicked Men: for very wicked

Oxford, November 5, 1745.

II

wicked Men they must be, who set about to do the greatest Injuries, not only to *single Persons*, but to *whole Societies* of their Fellow-Creatures. An Injury of *this Kind*, among the many other *Breaches*, they have made upon us, we may fairly reckon the *intended Destruction of the King and Parliament*. When, for the Sake of its Propagation, a Scheme of Religion fosters such a Design as this, it can never be of *divine Authority*. I say then, that such a Scheme of Religion, by whomsoever countenanced, like other Injuries, may be resisted.

BUT as it is a Doubt with some People, *Proof of the Second Proposition* Whether it be *lawful* to resist an Injury, especially if it proceed from those, they think their *Superiors*, or take Countenance from their Authority; it behoves me here to make good the *second Proposition*, and to shew, *That where Men are treated injuriously, and contrary to Nature, they may, consistently with the Laws of GOD, resist their Enemies, let their Condition be what it will.* Breach for Breach, Eye for Eye, Tooth for Tooth, &c.

EVERY Man has, *by Nature*, a Right to *Men are by Nature, possessed of certain Rights and Privileges.* Safety in his Person, Effects, and other Circumstances; unless that Right be some how *forfeited*. In Society Men are always considered in this View, and are protected in the Enjoyment of these Privileges by the Civil Magistrate. If he acts in his true *By what Means* Character,

they are se-
cured to
them in So-
ciety:—
And by
what Per-
sons.

Character, he watches for the Safety of his People; restrains, resists, and punishes, those who hurt his Subjects. What are Wars abroad, what are Stripes and Imprisonment, and the Tortures and Death of Criminals at home, but so many Acts of *Resistance* against *Acts of Violence*? These Proceedings at least are universally so interpreted, universally allowed by all civilized Nations, as founded upon Nature and Reason, and calculated for the Preservation of Society. Imagine only all Restraints removed, and the injurious Part of Mankind let loose upon the Innocent: And what Devastation, Rapine, and Bloodshed; what Affliction and Misery in every Shape, and on every Side must overwhelm Mankind? Impunity always supposes Encouragement: To fall prostrate before these Beasts of Prey, is to invite them to the Spoil; it is abetting their Party, helping them to extirpate all that's good, and to banish from among Men their Safety and their Happiness.

It appears then, that in all Countries some Men ought to be Opposers of Injuries; and throughout the known World, where Societies are formed some Men are really set apart for this Purpose.

Magistra-
cies not al-
ways of the
same Form:
—and
why.

It may be observ'd in different States and Nations, that these are not always People of exactly the same Figure and Condition.

AND for this there is good Reason, be-
cause

Oxford, November, 5, 1745.

13

cause those Circumstances are to be regulated from time to time, according to the original *Compact* of the State, the *great Charter*, that binds them in Society, and according to the various *Circumstances* under which the Common wealth at different *Seasons* may subsist.

IN its first flourishing and *best* Condition, when like a new Ship sailing from an Harbour in fair Weather, all is in good Order from within, all is serene and pleasant from without, the Power of opposing Enemies, and suppressing Tumults, will be in the Hands of those Officers, of whom the Government of the Vessel upon its first Regulation was composed: But as in the Ship, so in the State, the Right of Opposition may devolve to others, and depart from them, who at first held it, *When created they may be changed.*

The Right of opposing Injuries is originally to be sure in every Individual. Upon uniting in Society, Men so transfer this Right to those, they call their Governors, as to exercise it no more themselves, but in Cases where the Governor's Power wilfully fails, or is * accidentally not at hand to assist them. *The Right of opposing Injuries originally in Individuals, but in Society transferred in the first place to Rulers.*

* The Author in this Passage shews, by a fundamental Law of Nature, that *Associations were not illegal*, tho' a contrary Cry was much in the Mouths of some People at the Time, when this Sermon was preaching.

RULERS

RULERS then, whether they be few or many, or by whatsoever Titles they may be distinguished, are by their Office constituted; and for this End hold their Authority to be a Terror to those who do wrong, and to defend the natural Rights and Privileges of their People. There is by Nature a tacit Compact of this kind between Magistrates and People; And in most Places a formal Engagement, confirm'd by solemn Oaths, and Obligations on both Sides.

Governors thus invested may lose their Authority, or the People resume it, or transmit it to another.

GOVERNORS thus invested with this Authority may lose it, and the People resume it back unto themselves, or transmit it to another, as Necessity shews the Occasion.

I SAY, Governors may lose this Authority: For they are by their Office, as far as the State can enable them, to ward off Injuries.

A Case wherein the Right of Resistance devolves to the People.

ONE Case then wherein the People may resume this Power of resisting Injuries, and execute it for themselves, will be, where the State is in imminent Danger from an Enemy, and the Magistrate impowered to resist him, shall refuse to execute his Office.

A Proof of its being consistent with the Laws of Nature.

FOR if you would have a Society subsist, those Injuries which would overturn it, must be repelled. If the Governor, or Governors refuse to act, it is plain the State cannot be saved by them: For Injuries cannot be repelled by *Inaction* and *Non-resistance*. Its Safety then must come from another

Oxford, November 5, 1745.

13

another Quarter. And because the breaking up of a State, and loosing the Bands of Society must threaten Destruction to the Members that compose it, it will be lawful in such a Conjunction for the People to save themselves in the best manner that they are able, since every Man, unless he be a Criminal, has a Right to Self-preservation, and may singly exert this Right, or concur in the public Motions of the People, who are for saving themselves, by saving the State, and uniting under a Government, that will protect it.

It is plain then, in an imminent Danger of the State, where the Governor, though in a Capacity, *refuses* to act, that the People may take to themselves the *Power of resisting* a public Enemy.

AND this is not the only Case, wherein *This not the only Case wherein* *Resistance is allowed the People.* For supposing the Magistrate, which is natural enough, upon forsaking his own Subjects, to league with the Enemy, or upon his own Bottom to grow injurious, the People *Resistance is allowed the People. They may in some* may then resist that Magistrate.

FOR if those very Persons, who are empowered and authorized for the Defence of the Society, turn their Authority and Power against it, and instead of suppressing, commit Injuries, they are certainly to be reputed public Enemies. For a public Enemy *in some Circumstances resist a Magistrate.* could do nothing worse. The Power of *The Reason and Nature of* resisting

*Society so
requiring.*

resisting Injuries therefore must in this Case immediately change Place; since for the Preservation of Society, it must subsist somewhere, and the same Person cannot at the same Time be both Offender, and the Punisher of his Offences. It revolves then back to those, who gave it; and in regard it is to be employed against such as do Injuries, it will bear hard upon any that are found in that Character, without having respect to any *nominal* Distinction.

THERE are Seasons then, wherein it is lawful for common People to resist an Injury; nay, even to oppose the Person of a Governor, if he depart from his proper Character, and become injurious.

*Resistance
of Injuries
the Doc-
trine of
revealed
Religion.*

WHAT has been advanced upon this Head seems, for good Reasons, to be agreeable to the Law of Nature, and therefore agreeable to the Gospel, which, as a *divine* Dispensation, must coincide with, and conform to, the Law of Nature: and such a Conformity is always to be looked upon as an essential Mark of its divine Original. If the Law of Nature and the Gospel have been set at Variance upon this Subject, it is a great Misfortune, and all who wish well to the Latter, must endeavour to reconcile it with the Former; which Reconciliation, perhaps, if the Gospel were rightly apprehended, is not a Matter of so great Difficulty. There is good Reason to assert this, be-
cause

Oxford, November 5, 1745.

17

cause *our Saviour* himself expressly declares, * That he came *not to destroy the (Moral) Law, but to fulfil it.* If there be a Difference then between it and the Gospel, it must be in People's Misapprehension, and not a real Difference: And upon this Footing I think we ought not to affirm that what *our Saviour* says in his Comment upon the Words of the Text, *An Eye for an Eye, &c.* is a flat Contradiction to the Precept, *i. e.* a Command of indispensable Obligation opposed to another of the same Obligation: But we ought rather to say, that what *our Saviour* advances in this Passage, is no such Command at all, but only a Piece of prudent Counsel, and good Advice to the *Jews*, who being of a cruel and malicious Disposition, might carry a Law in itself calculated for the Peace and Safety of Society, into an Abuse, by straining it farther than was necessary to those Ends, to gratify a revengeful Temper. Beside what I have mentioned, there are other Reasons to believe this to be only a Matter of bare Counsel, since *the Gospel* is such a copious System of *Etbicks* as to provide us with good Rules, even for *common Actions*. Thus our Saviour says (*Luke xiv. 8.*) *When thou art bidden of any Man to a Wedding, sit not down in the highest Room, &c.* Now this is delivered in the *Imperative Mood*; and if you regard

* *Mai. v. 17.*

the Phrase only, looks as much like a *Command* as *thou shalt not kill*, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*. But no reasonable Man in expounding these Words will say that they are of the same Importance, or that a Man would hazard his Salvation by sitting higher at a Feast, than is agreeable to his *Quality*. There seems to be no more spiritual Danger in the Case, if one, that had lost his Coat should endeavour to keep his Cloak from the Adversary. The Truth is, this way of delivering both *Commands* and *Counsels* in the same Language is almost universally the Method in *Scripture*, and agreeable to the Usage of the *Eastern Nations*. *St. Paul*, indeed, who was a Native of *Cilicia* a Province in the Neighbourhood of the Greek Cities of *Asia Minor*, had from the Place of his Birth, and his Conversation with the *Gentiles*, contracted more of the Language and Manners of the *Greeks*, and with their Elegance tells you, as the Subject requires, what you are to look upon as *Advice*, and what as a Matter of * *Duty*: But our Saviour whose Scene of Action was in *Judaea*, among his own Countrymen, speaks in *their* Manner; delivers his *Counsels* and *Commands* in one Form, and leaves us to judge from the Subject of the Importance of either. Thus in this Place it is not *all kinds* of Resistance that he forbids,

* *Cor. vii. 25.*

but

Oxford, November, 5, 1745.

19

but such as is *carried too far*, or exercised to our Disadvantage upon Trifles, where the Matter being of small Concern, yielding a little would be most for our Interest. This seems to be our *Saviour's* Meaning, and not that he would have us submit to the greatest Injuries, where there is a *Resource*, and no other Resource but by *resisting*. When the Men of *Sodom* † pressed hard upon *Lot*, would the *Son of God* have bidden him submit to their Bestiality? So far from that, that he is supposed to be one of the *two Men* that did resist them, that forcibly secured *Lot* from the intended Injury, and struck the Inhabitants with Blindness. Agreeable to this Conduct was the Doctrine of our *Saviour* while he dwelt among us. He says, *It must needs be*, in the Course of things, *that Offences will come*, and pronounces *Woe* against him *by whom the Offence cometh* *. What is this *Woe* but the *Punishment* due to the Offence? And Punishments we say are in their Nature, Acts of Resistance to prevent the Increase of Violence. Our *Saviour's* Speech then implies, that Wrongs are to be resisted: Because Punishment implies Resistance. He speaks of one *King going to War with another King*, † as a thing subsisting in the Course of Nature, which passes without his Condemnation. His *Forerunner*, who was to *prepare the Way*

† Gen. xix, 10. * Mat. xviii. 77. † Luke xiv. 31.

before him by teaching the same Morality, when he was asked by the *Soldiers*, those public Instruments of Resistance, what he took to be their Duty, does not bid them quit their Profession as unlawful; allowing them thereby to repel Injuries, tho' he orders them to do no Violence, and to be content with the Wages || which the State allotted them. But to dwell no longer upon the Subject, our Saviour himself when Occasion required it, orders such of his Disciples as might be without a Sword to sell his Garment and buy one §. Thus much in Confirmation of the first Step we advanced. By the written Law of God, and the Terms of the Gospel Injuries in general may be resisted.

AND for the particular Cases, that followed this general Conclusion, they also may be supported by Authorities from the New Testament.

Resistance
in the first
Case above
cited, vin-
dicated
from Holy
Scripture.

As first, That where a Governor impowered refuses to act, and the State be in imminent Danger, the People may take to themselves the Power of resisting an Enemy.

ST. Paul says, that A † Governor is a Minister of GOD, for the Subject, to execute Wrath upon the Injurious; and that he beareth not the Sword in vain. The People then, who have a Magistrate over them, that careth not to redress their Injuries, are, according to the Scripture Definition, without

|| Luke iii. 14. § Luke xxii. 36. † Rom. xiii. 4.

a Gover-

Oxford, November, 5, 1745.

21

a Governor. Injuries therefore in this Case may be resisted by the *People*: Since by the former Scriptures it appears, that they may be resisted by *somebody*; and where the Magistrate *bears the Sword in vain*, the People are the only remaining Instruments of Resistance.

AND, *secondly*, this *Resistance*, by the Terms of Scripture, may be carried against the Governor *himself*, if to *Negligence* he addeth *Violence and Injuries*.

Resistance in the second Case, vindicated from Holy Scripture.

WHEN St. Paul * called Nero a *Lion*, the Apostle, under the Influence of God's *Holy Spirit*, and the Roman Senate, under the Direction of the *Law of Nature*, judged both the *same Judgment*. They, indeed, as being able to make head against him, declared openly, † that he was an Enemy, and that he should be immediately brought to Punishment; while St. Paul, as one under the Paw of the Lion, and almost in the Jaws of the Savage, speaks with more Caution, tho' in effect the same Language.

THE Scripture in the very Detail of our Duty towards Superiors, reminds us of *our Freedom*, and only warns us not to make use of it as * a *Cloak of Maliciousness* against a good Governor. For it represents, as the State of Things, which *should* obtain; the Governor always good; and the People always free, that is possessed of all such Privileges

* 2. Tim. iv. 17. † Sueton, in Nerone Claudio. * Pet. ii. 16.

as by Law belong to them. If the Governor forcibly break thro' those Laws, which secure their Liberties, he intrenches upon the Peoples Freedom; and the People, to secure their Freedom, must in proportion resist that Governor. All this is contained in the Notion of *Freedom*. And if the Scripture supposes *Liberty* in the *Subject*, it allows them, in defence of it, to *resist* their *Governor*, if there be just Occasion.

UPON the whole then we may conclude, that *where Men are treated injuriously, and contrary to Nature, they may, consistently with the Laws of God, resist their Enemy, let his Condition be what it will.*

*The Appli-
cation of
the Doc-
trine of
the second
Head to
the REVO-
LUTION.*

THIS Point being clear'd, I shall, by way of Conclusion, apply the Doctrine advanced under this *second* Head to the *other great Event* we this Day commemorate, the *REVO- LUTION*; that, from the *Application*, we may be able to judge, *how far the Conduct of the People of these Kingdoms, upon that Occasion, may be justified.*

WE have shewn, that *Resistance*, rightly circumstanced, is *consistent* with the *Laws of God*. Upon the same Footing we say, That where a *Governor* will not oppose a public Enemy, the *People* may themselves oppose that Enemy. And *lastly*, That if their *Governor* take part with the Enemy, and thereby assume the same Character, the *People* may, by the *same Laws* oppose that *Governor*.

IN

Oxford, November 5, 1745.

23

IN applying the Doctrine of the *first* ^{And vindicated by the Laws of the Land.} Head to the POPISH CONSPIRACY, I remarked, that the Introduction of the *popish* Religion, a Religion that fostered Designs of Cruelty and Bloodshed, was, by the *Law of Nature*, and of consequence by the *Terms of the Gospel*, an Injury to any Nation. Before the Reign of *James II.* the King and People of *England* had likewise, by their own Laws, made it an Injury to them in particular; since, by the *Statutes of the Realm*, they had opposed a * *Barrier to Popery*, and excluded as common Enemies, all Persons professing *that Religion*, from all *Offices Civil and Military*, and all *Places of Trust*, in the Government. *Human Laws*, when thus founded on *Divine*, are certainly *good Laws*; and any *Restorer* of the *popish* Religion was, upon this Foundation, undoubtedly to be adjudged an Enemy.

THE King of *England*, by the Neglect of these Enemies, had in effect resigned back to the *People* the Power of opposing them themselves. They had in vain † *reposed a Confidence on his gracious Word for the Defence of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND*; inasmuch as he himself herded with the Enemy, and abetted their Party. The Law against *Papists* could not be repealed, but by the same Power that made it. The King, to undermine it, called all the Laws of *England* HIS

* *Wellswood's Memoirs.*

† *Address of the Commons.*

Laws.

Laws, and assumed a Power of *dispensing* with *this*, and by consequence with *any other*. To this Effect he published a Declaration in favour of the *popish* Religion, commanding it to be read by the Clergy of the Church established. The *Archbishop* of *Canterbury*, and *six* of the *Bishops*, for petitioning against this *Declaration*, were imprisoned. The *Bishop* of *London*, and one of the Principal of his Clergy, for their Dislike to Popery, were suspended: And that there might not be wanting a Power to *compel*, as Matters grew riper, the *King* kept a great *Army* on foot, consisting chiefly of *Papists*, and into their Hands likewise he put his Forts and Garrisons. This unhappy, deluded Prince then, by the *Laws* of his *Country*, as well as the *Laws* of *God* and *Nature*, was among his *Protestant Subjects*, deemed a *public Enemy*. A Governor, in this Character, may be *resisted*; and his People, forsaken by him, do no Wrong in fixing the supreme Power in the Hands of those, that will protect them.

The Cir-
stances
of those
Times con-
sidered,
with rela-
tion to the
present.

I HAVE been the more particular in this Detail of *past Times*, and the Principles upon which the Body of the *English Nation* acted, in that Conjunction, because the *PRETENDERS* to the Crown of these Kingdoms, the present *Invaders* of our Rights and Properties, come instigated by the same hostile Principles, abetted by the same hostile Pow-
ers,

Oxford, November 5, 1745.

25

ers, to establish the same hateful and bloody Superstition, which was expelled at the *Abdication* of *James II.* The Concurrence of the *same Circumstances* makes it necessary to direct to the *same End*, (its only right and proper End) that *Spirit of Opposition* which is inseparable from the *English Nation*. For it is a Spirit very capable of being misguided: It has sometimes believed the most impudent Lyes, and as *obstinately* opposed the most evident Truths; it has followed the Call of all Sorts of People; of *Jesuits* and *Republicans*, and (what is as bad as either, because they are the *Instruments* of *both*) the infamous Tribe of hireling Scribes and Demagogues, People without Conscience, without Property, who are at once the Product and Bane of Liberty, that through the Licentiousness of our Times have been suffered to breathe, and taint the Air by Breathing. No! let not any one think by setting *Opposition* on its *right Footing*, that we go about to justify *every Revolution*: Some in *England* have been perhaps our Curse and Infamy. *Kings* are not to be opposed because they *are Kings*; nor are we rashly to run with the *Beasts of the People*, when they are stung to Madness, and driven by the Artifice of malignant Faction. Our Guides, upon important Occasions, should be the wiser and better Sort. And what the Sentiments of these are, may be collected

lected from the Speeches and Addresses of the Nobility, Gentry, and Clergy of the Nation, and from the Sermons of our Bishops and Prelates.

HOWEVER the Weight of Taxes may have affected some of us, it is to be considered, that the *additional Burthen* to those Taxes has been laid on with the *common Consent* of the People of England, to support two foreign Wars begun at *their own Instance*. If some profligate Wretches, by their expensive Follies, and more expensive Vices, have ruined themselves and their Dependents, and laid that to the Charge of the Government, which ought to be charged on their Debaucheries, we are not blindly to think a Nation undone because such People are undone, whose Fate would have been the same under any Government: Nor are we to learn public Counsels from such as cannot manage a private Fortune; but our Duty is, under the Direction of wise and good Counsellors, deliberately and conscientiously to consider the Causes and Consequences of a Revolution: And alas! in the present State of Things, by such an Event could we be Gainers? The Cause of the *late Revolution* was the Dread of *Po-pery* and *arbitrary Power*, and the Apprehension of losing every thing that was dear to us as *Men* and *Christians*, and the Consequences of it under a Succession of Protestant

Oxford, November 5, 1745.

27

testant Princes have been the Enjoyment of our *religious* and *civil Liberties*, and such an Increase of *Wealth*, by the Extent of our *Commerce*, as has elevated the *Commoners* and *Merchants* of these Kingdoms almost to a Level with *foreign Princes*. This being the Case, a *Revolution* at *this Day*, from the Quarter some thoughtless People expect it, can serve to no Purpose but the Introduction of *Popery* and *arbitrary Power*, and the fixing upon our Necks the immoveable Yoke of two formidable foreign Powers beside. The Consequence of which must be, the Extinction of our *religious* and *civil Liberties*, an universal Change of Property, and a long and various civil War, attended with a Sea of Bloodshed.

It is natural to enquire here by what Infatuation any who call themselves *Protestants* can be led to look for *such a Revolution*: And, would the Time permit, it would not at this Juncture be unseasonable, in an Assembly, that owes its Institution to a political Occasion, to reckon up the Artifices that have been used, and the Accidents that have concurred, to work so far upon common Minds as to make some of them disaffected to their own Happiness.

For our *subtle Neighbours* have learnt to manage so well the *deluded English*, as to improve some Circumstances into Discontent, which ought to have taken another Turn,
and

and been the Ground of our highest Affection to our Sovereign. *His Majesty* having been particularly active, both in his own Person, and as far as ever he could extend his Influence, against the growing Tyranny of the *French*, in consequence of this grew heartily *bated* by *them*; which is one good Reason why he should be heartily *loved* by every *Englishman*. But to prevent this, if possible, the Emissaries of that Nation have been dextrous in amusing such as would attend to them, with false Glosses and political Paradoxes. We have been told, that *England* has no Concerns with the *Continent*; and that we are wrong in endeavouring to put a Stop to the Acquisitions of our Enemies in that Quarter. Now there is not an *Husbandman* in *England* but knows, that the extending of his Neighbour's Grounds must be the lessening of his own, and that by how much the greater he [the Neighbour] grows in Estate and Riches, by so much the abler he is to oppress him. As obvious as this Truth may seem to the meanest Understanding, the collected People of *England* cannot believe one, which is quite as easy, *That the Increase of French Territory is the Increase of French Power*,

I FORBEAR to say by what particular Persons or Parties among us these Delusions have been propagated; because this is not a Season for *Englishmen* to accuse each other.

Many

Oxford, November, 5, 1745.

29

Many different People have concurred in the same Work, till some of them, seeing their Tendency, have been alarmed at their own Proceedings. *Ambition* and *Avarice*, the *Wantonness* of some, and the *Folly* and *Ignorance* of others, nay the very *Fashion of the Times*, have conspired with the Enemies of our Church and State, in propagating Disaffection to a Prince, who hath made his *Peoples Interest* and *his own* inseparable; who hath governed not by his *Will*, but by the *Laws of the Land*; and in the Course of a longer Period than perhaps is to be paralleled in *British History*, (however their treasonable Practices may have deserved it) never suffered the spilling of a single Subject's Blood; but, on the contrary, turned all his Resentment against the *common Enemy*, exposing his *own Person*, and that of his *Royal Descendants*, to all the Perils of War, which he carried against the Borders of the Enemy, far from our happy, peaceful *Britain*: While we, through our Folly and Wickedness, have, in an unnatural Manner, against *him*, and against *ourselves*, kindled it in the Bowels of our native Country, to the great Hazard of our *Liberty* and our *Religion*.

It is time that we recollect ourselves: And though, for the *Abuse* of *both* these Blessings, we *deserve neither*; yet may God Almighty

Almighty leave us our *Liberty* and our *Religion*! If not, yet for that we have been happy, we ought still to render him *All Honour and Glory, Might, Majesty, and Dominion, both now and for ever.*

4 OC 58
